

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 23, 2005. Claims 45-50 were pending in the Office Action, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this amendment, claims 51 and 52 is added and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

At the top of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner requested that Applicant provide a copy of a publication previously listed on the form PTO-1449 submitted by Applicant. A copy of that publication is enclosed herewith.

At the middle of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 45-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parkinson et al. (US Patent No. 6,088,457). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

The present invention deals with a content provider that provides a programming message to a mobile device having a one-way radio receiver (such as a pager). One problem with such a system arises in programming the mobile device. The mobile device (because it has only a one-way radio), cannot transmit an acknowledgement that it has been re-programmed. In one embodiment claimed herein, the pager synchronizes an acknowledgement of receipt of the message to a desktop computer which, in turn, transmits the acknowledgment to the content provider.

There is simply no mention, whatsoever, in the prior art reference cited by the Examiner, of a mobile device synchronizing an acknowledgement to a desktop computer for transmission back to the content provider, from the desktop computer. Instead, in order for a message to be transmitted back to computer 1401 from pager 1405, in Parkinson et al., the pager must have a receiver/transceiver component 301. In other words, the pager both receives radio messages from the content provider and transmits radio messages back to the content provider with

receiver/transceiver 301. There is no teaching or suggestion, whatsoever, that any type of acknowledgement is synchronized to a desktop computer for transmission from the desktop computer back to the content provider.

In order to meet the feature of synchronization of the acknowledge message to the desktop computer, the Examiner cited the timer circuit in Parkinson et al. It is respectfully submitted that this has nothing to do with synchronization of messages from a mobile device to a desktop computer. Instead, in order to enable the pager to receive messages, Parkinson et al. sets the timer circuit for a time-out period. When the timer circuit has run for the specified time, the time-out period lapses and the timer circuit provides a signal to the processing logic 304 to disable the processing logic. Parkinson et al. does this in order to save power. For instance, Parkinson et al. may set the timer logic for a 5-minute time-out period and then transmit a message to the pager. The pager can then shutdown so that it need not look for additional messages, once the time-out period has elapsed. Of course, this has nothing to do with synchronizing an acknowledge message from a mobile device to a desktop computer, for transmission back to a content provider.

By contrast, independent claim 45 specifically claims "a mobile device synchronization component coupled to the mobile device processing component; a desktop computing device selectively coupleable to the mobile device and including a desktop synchronization component operable with the mobile device synchronization component to synchronize the acknowledge message to the desktop computing device...". This feature is simply neither mentioned nor even suggested by Parkinson et al. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 45 is allowable over Parkinson et al.

Similarly, Applicant has added new independent claim 51. Claim 51 states that the originator component is not only

configured to form a programming message for transmission to the mobile device, but that it is "further configured to receive an acknowledge message, synchronized from the mobile device to a desktop computer, from a desktop communication component." Again, Parkinson et al. simply teaches no such originator component in which the originator component is configured to receive an acknowledge message that was synchronized to a desktop computer from a mobile device.

Applicant has also added new claim 52. Claim 52 is directed to a mobile device which includes a synchronization component for synchronizing an acknowledge message, in response to receiving a transmitted programming message from an originator component, to a desktop computer, for transmission back to the originator component. Again, Parkinson et al. neither teaches nor suggest such a system.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that independent claims 45, 51 and 52 are allowable. Applicant further submits that claims 46-50 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claim 45. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 45-52.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg